arXiv:1601.07365v5 [math.OC] 10 Aug 2016

Endogenizing the cost parameter in Cournot oligopoly*

Stefanos Leonardos[†1] and Costis Melolidakis[‡1]

[1]*Section of Statistics and Operations Research, Department of Mathematics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Panepistimioupolis GR-157 84, Athens, Greece*

August 11, 2016

Abstract

We study a single product market with affine inverse demand function in which two producers/retailers, producing under capacity constraints, may order additional quantities from a single profit maximizing supplier. We express this chain as a two stage game and show that it has a unique subgame perfect Nash equilibrium, which we explicitly calculate. If the supplier faces uncertainty about the demand intercept and whenever a Bayesian Nash equilibrium exists, the supplier's profit margin at equilibrium is a fixed point of a translation of the MRL function of his belief under the assumption that his belief is non-atomic and the retailers are identical. If the supplier's belief is of Decreasing Mean Residual Lifetime (DMRL), the game has a unique subgame perfect Bayesian Nash equilibrium. Various properties of the equilibrium solution are established, inefficiencies at equilibrium generated by the lack of information of the supplier are investigated, and examples are provided for various interesting cases. Finally, the main results are generalized for more than two identical producers/retailers.

Keywords: Cournot Nash, Nash Equilibrium, Duopoly, Incomplete Information, Existence, Uniqueness
Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 91A10, 91A40

1 Introduction

The main objective of this paper is to examine equilibria in a classic Cournot market with affine inverse demand function, when the competing firms' cost is affected exogenously by a supplier, who may even be uncertain about the demand parameter of the market. As Marx and Schaffer [2015] point out, although Cournot's model has become the workhorse model of oligopoly theory, there has been very little discussion about the origin of the competing firms costs in the quite vast Cournot literature. As they underline, if

*This research has been co-financed by the European Union (European Social Fund ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Program "Education and Lifelong Learning" of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) - Research Funding Program "ARISTEIA II: Optimization of Stochastic Systems Under Partial Information and Application, Investing in knowledge society through the European Social Fund".
Stefanos Leonardos gratefully acknowledges support by a scholarship of the Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation.

[†]sleonardos@math.uoa.gr
[‡]cmelol@math.uoa.gr

these costs represent purchases from a third party, then important strategic considerations come into play, which are not addressed by the prevailing approach. Marx and Schaffer question the robustness of the results obtained thus far in the Cournot oligopoly theory due to this negligence.

The key in studying the effects of an exogenous source of supply for Cournot oligopolists is the relation between demand and the various costs. If the demand is high enough, the competing firms may have incentive to place orders to an external supplier, depending of course on the price he asks. In the classic original Cournot model, the crucial parameter concerning demand is the y-intercept of the affine inverse demand function, which implies its important role in studying Cournot markets with exogenous supply. Next, in such a study, various questions have to be addressed: Do the firms have production capacities of their own? If yes, then these capacities have to be assumed bounded (as they are in reality), so that need may arise for additional quantities. Does the supplier know the actual demand the oligopolists face? If no, then he may ask for a price that the competing firms will not accept, even if it is to his advantage not to do so. The latter question implies an incomplete information game setup.

It is the aim of this paper to address the questions raised above and contribute to extending the classic Cournot theory to oligopolists that may purchase additional quantities from an external supplier. By viewing the interaction of the competing Cournot oligopolists with their supplier as a two stage game, the cost parameter of the classic Cournot model is endogenized and answers can be worked out.

As we shall see, obtaining the equilibrium strategies for the Cournot firms in such a market may be very tedious, but nevertheless manageable *after* one formulates the setup. However, the case for the supplier, who is also a player in this game, is somehow more demanding. In the duopoly case, if the supplier knows the true value of the demand parameter, a unique subgame perfect equilibrium always exists, although its description is quite complicated (see Propositions A.1 and A.2 in the Appendix). In all other cases (three or more oligopolists and/or incomplete information), the study of equilibria is possible only if we assume that the competing firms are identical. So, assuming that the oligopolists are identical, we obtain concrete results concerning the price the supplier will ask in both the complete and the incomplete information case under equilibrium. In the latter, when the supplier does not know the demand parameter, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a subgame perfect equilibrium via a fixed point equation involving a translation of the Mean Residual Lifetime (MRL) of his belief, provided the measure this belief induces on the demand parameter space is non-atomic. If they exist, the evaluation of all subgame perfect equilibria is possible by using this equation, i.e. our approach is constructive. The MRL function is well known among actuarials, reliability engineers, and applied probabilists but, to our knowledge, has never arisen before in a Cournot context.

In detail, inspired by the classic Cournot oligopoly where producers/retailers compete over quantity, we study the market of a homogenous good differing from the classic model in the following aspects. Each producer/retailer may produce only a limited quantity of the good up to a specified and commonly known production capacity. If needed, the retailers may refer to a single supplier to order additional quantities. The supplier may produce unlimited quantities but at a higher cost than the retailers, making it best for the retailers to exhaust their production capacities before placing additional orders. The market clears at a price that is determined by an affine inverse demand function. The demand parameter or demand intercept is considered to be a random variable with a commonly known non-atomic distribution having a finite expectation.

Depending on the time of the demand realization, two variations of this market structure are examined, which correspond to a complete and an incomplete information two-stage game played as follows. In the first stage the supplier fixes a price by deciding his profit margin and then in the second stage, the retailers, knowing this price and the true value of the demand parameter, decide their production quantity (up to capacity) and also place their orders (if any). The decisions of the producers/retailers are simultaneous. If the supplier knows the true value of the demand parameter before making his decision as well, this is an

ordinary two stage game (and the demand random variable is just a formality). On the other hand, if the random demand parameter is realized after the supplier has set his price, then this is a two stage game of incomplete information where the demand distribution is the belief of the supplier about this variable. So, in both variations the demand uncertainty is resolved prior to the decision of the retailers, who always know the true value of the demand intercept. In this respect, our setup differs from the usual incomplete information models of Cournot markets, where demand uncertainty involves the producers (e.g. see Einy et al. [2010] and references given therein).

The limited production capacities of the producers/retailers may equivalently be viewed as inventory quantities that may be drawn at a fixed cost per unit. The latter setting corresponds to the operation of a retailer's cooperative (hence the characterization of the 'producers' as retailers' also). In case the production capacities are 0, this is a classic Cournot model with the cost input determined exogenously. Marx and Schaffer [2015] point out the scarceness of research along this line and the need of endogenizing the cost parameter in the Cournot model. To do so, they study the game that arises when competing Cournot firms purchase their inputs from a common supplier based on contracts, with the competing firms having the bargaining power.

We study the equilibrium behavior of the two-stage game by first determining the unique equilibrium solution of the second stage game, which concerns the quantities that the producers/retailers will produce and the additional quantities they will order from the supplier. This stage is the same in both the complete and the incomplete information case and is solved completely. Then, we examine the first stage game, which concerns the price the supplier will ask for the product. In the case of the complete information duopoly (two producers/retailers-supplier knows the demand parameter), a unique subgame-perfect Nash equilibrium always exists, which we give explicitly in the Appendix. Its description is quite complicated as it is very sensitive to the relationship of all parameters of the problem. Otherwise, we proceed by considering identical producers/retailers. Under this assumption, the complete information case simplifies significantly. However, our focus is mainly on the incomplete information case. For that case, we show that if a subgame perfect Bayesian-Nash equilibrium exists, then it will necessarily be a fixed point of a translation of the Mean Residual Lifetime (MRL) function of the supplier's belief. If the support of the supplier's belief is bounded, then such an equilibrium exists. If the MRL function is decreasing (as in most "well behaved" distributions), then a subgame perfect equilibrium always exists and is unique, irrespective of the supplier's belief support. In addition, we investigate the behavior of this subgame perfect equilibrium in various interesting cases.

A well known byproduct of incomplete information is the appearance of inefficiencies in the sense that transactions that would have been beneficial for all market participants are excluded at equilibrium under incomplete information, while this wouldn't have been the case under complete information. In the present paper, an upper bound on a measure of inefficiency over all DMRL distributions is derived, it is shown that it is tight, and the implications of the structure of the supplier's belief on the efficiency of the incomplete information equilibrium are investigated.

Under incomplete information, the DMRL property is sufficient for the existence of a unique optimal strategy for the supplier, but not necessary. Possible relaxations of this condition are examined, basically in terms of the increasing generalized failure rate (IGFR) condition, see Lariviere [2006]. As far as necessary conditions are concerned, we don't have a characterization of the distribution when an equilibrium exists, although we have a characterization of the equilibrium itself through the MRL function. Finally, as far as the inverse demand function is concerned, its affinity assumption may not be dropped if one still wants to express the supplier's payoff in terms of the MRL function. Hence, a generalization in models with non-affine inverse demand function is open.

As a dynamic two-stage model, the current work combines elements from various active research areas. Cournot competition with an external supplier having uncertainty about the demand intercept may be viewed

as an application of game theoretic tools and concepts in supply chain management. However, we are interested in the equilibrium behavior of the incomplete information two stage game rather than to building coordination mechanisms. The incomplete information of the supplier relates our work to incomplete information Cournot models, although the lack of information refers to the producers in most papers in this area. Having capacity constraints for the producers/consumers, as it is necessary for our model, has also attracted attention in the Cournot literature, see eg. Bischi et al. [2009]. Finally, the application of the concept of the mean residual lifetime, which originates from reliability theory, to a purely economic setting is another research area to which our paper is related.

Cachon and Netessine [2004] survey the applications of game theoretic concepts in supply chain analysis in detail and provide a thorough literature review up to 2004. They state that the concept that is mostly used is that of static non-cooperative games and highlight the need for a game theoretic analysis of more dynamic settings. At the time of their survey, they report of only two papers that apply the solution concept of the subgame perfect equilibrium (in settings quite different to ours). Bernstein and Federgruen [2005] investigate the equilibrium behavior of a decentralized supply chain with competing retailers under demand uncertainty. Their model accounts for demand uncertainty from the retailers' point of view also and focuses mainly on the design of contracts that will coordinate the supply chain. Based on whether the uncertainty of the demand is resolved prior to or after the retailers' decisions, they identify two main streams of literature. For the first stream, in which the present paper may be placed, they refer to Vives [2001] for an extensive survey.

Einy et al. [2010] examine Cournot competition under incomplete producers' information about the demand and production costs. They provide examples of such games without a Bayesian Cournot equilibrium in pure strategies, they discuss the implication of not allowing negative prices and provide additional sufficient conditions that will guarantee existence and uniqueness of equilibrium. Richter [2013] discusses Cournot competition under incomplete producers' information about their production capacities and proves the existence of equilibrium under the assumption of stochastic independence of the unknown capacities. He also discusses simplifications of the inverse demand function that result to symmetric equilibria and implications of information sharing among the producers.

Capacity constrained duopolies are mostly studied in the view of price rather than quantity competition. Osborne and Pitchik [1986] and the references therein are among the classics in this field. Equally common is the study of models where the capacity constraints are viewed as inventories kept by the retailers at a lower cost. Papers in this direction focus mainly on determining optimal policies in building the inventory over more than one periods. Hartwig et al. [2015] and the references therein are indicative of this field of research.

The condition of decreasing mean residual lifetime that arises in our treatment, is closely related to the more general concept of log-concave probability. In an inspiring survey, Bagnoli and Bergstrom [2005] examine a series of theorems relating log-concavity and/or log-convexity of probability density functions, distribution functions, reliability functions, and their integrals and point out numerous applications of log-concave probability that arise, among other areas, in mechanism design, monopoly theory and in the analysis of auctions. Lagerlöf [2006] examines a Cournot duopoly where the producers do not know the demand intercept but have a common belief about it. Under the condition that the distribution of the demand intercept has monotone hazard rate and an additional mild technical assumption, he proves uniqueness of equilibrium. Guess and Proschan [1988] survey earlier advances about the mean residual lifetime function, its properties and its applications. Among many other fields, they mention a single economic application in a setting about optimal inventory policies for perishable items with variable supply which is however rather distinct from ours.

1.1 Outline

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we build up the formal setting for a duopoly. In Section 3 we present some preliminary results and treat the complete information case. In Section 4 we analyze the model of incomplete information, state our main results and highlight the special case with no production capacities for the retailers. In Section 5 we investigate inefficiencies caused by the lack of information on the true value of the demand parameter by the supplier. The use of results exhibited in the previous sections is highlighted by various examples and calculations of the subgame perfect equilibrium in Section 6. Finally, in Section 7 we generalize our results to the case of $n > 2$ - identical retailers. The proofs of Section 3 and Section 7 proceed by an extensive case discrimination and are presented in Appendix A.

Throughout the rest of this paper we drop the double name "producers/retailers" and keep the term "retailers" only.

2 The Model

2.1 Notation and preliminaries

We consider the market of a homogenous good that consists of two producers/retailers (R_1 and R_2) that compete over quantity (R_i places quantity Q_i) and a supplier (or wholesaler) under the following assumptions

1. The retailers may produce quantities t_1 and t_2 up to a capacities T_1 and T_2 respectively at a common fixed cost h per unit normalized to zero[1].
2. Additionally, they may order quantities q_1, q_2 from the supplier at a price w set prior to and independently of their orders. The total quantity $Q_i(w), i = 1, 2$ that each retailer releases to the market is equal to the sum

$$Q_i(w) := t_i(w) + q_i(w)$$

or shortly $Q_i := t_i + q_i$, where, for $i = 1, 2$, the variable $t_i \leq T_i$ is the quantity that retailer R_i produces by himself or draws from his inventory (at normalized zero cost) and q_i is the quantity that the retailer R_i orders from the supplier at price w.
3. The supplier may produce unlimited quantity of the good at a cost c per unit. We assume that the retailers are more efficient in the production of the good or equivalently that $c > h$. After the normalization of the retailers' production cost h to 0, the rest of the parameters i.e. w and c are also normalized. Thus, w represents a normalized price, i.e. the initial price that was set by the supplier minus the retailers' production cost and c a normalized cost, i.e. the supplier's initial cost minus the retailers' production cost. The supplier's profit margin r is not affected by the normalization and is equal to

$$r := w - c$$

4. After the total quantity $Q = Q_1 + Q_2$ that will be released to the market is set by the retailers, the market clears at a price p that is determined by an inverse demand function, which we assume to be affine[2]

$$p = \alpha - Q \tag{1}$$

[1] See Section 1 for an alternative interpretation of these quantities as inventories.

[2] After normalization of the slope parameter (initially denoted with β) of the inverse demand function to 1, all variables in (1) are expressed in the units of quantity and not in monetary units and therefore any interpretations or comparisons of the subsequent results should be done with caution.

5. The demand parameter α is a non-negative random variable with finite expectation $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) < +\infty$ and a continuous cumulative distribution function (cdf) F (i.e. the measure induced on the space of α is non-atomic–singular distribution functions, like the Cantor function, are acceptable). We will assume that $\alpha \geq h$ for all values of α, i.e. that the demand parameter is greater or equal to the retailers' production cost. The latter assumption is consistent with the classic Cournot duopoly model, which is resembled by the second stage of the game (however, the second stage game is not a classic Cournot duopoly due to the capacity constraints T_1 and T_2 and to the possibility of $w > \alpha$). After normalization, in what follows we will use the term α_H (resp. α_L) to denote the lower upper bound (resp. the upper lower bound) of the support of α.
6. The capacities T_1, T_2 and the distribution of the random demand parameter α are common knowledge among the three participants of the market (the retailers and the supplier).

Based on these assumptions, a strategy $s_i(w)$ for retailer $R_i, i = 1, 2$ is a vector valued function $s_i(w) = (t_i(w), q_i(w))$ or shortly a pair $s_i = (t_i, q_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Equation (1) implies that Q_i may not exceed α and hence the strategy set $\tilde{S}^i$ of R_i will satisfy

$$\tilde{S}^i \subset \{(t_i, q_i) : 0 \leq t_i \leq T_i \text{ and } 0 \leq q_i + t_i \leq \alpha\} \tag{2}$$

Denoting by $s := (s_1, s_2)$ a strategy profile, the payoff $u^i(s \mid w)$ of retailer $R_i, i = 1, 2$ will be given by

$$u^i(s \mid w) = Q_i(\alpha - Q) - wq_i = Q_i(\alpha - w - Q) + wt_i \tag{3}$$

Whenever confusion may not arise we will write $u^i(s)$ instead of $u^i(s \mid w)$. A strategy for the supplier is the price w he charges to the retailers or equivalently his profit margin r. From (3) we see that w may not exceed a_H, otherwise the retailers will not order for sure. Additionally, it may not be lower than c, since in that case his payoff will become negative. Hence, in terms of his profit margin r, the strategy set R of the supplier satisfies

$$R \subset \{r : 0 \leq r \leq \alpha_H - c\} \tag{4}$$

Consequently, a reasonable assumption is that $c < \alpha_H$, otherwise the problem becomes trivial from the supplier's perspective. For a given value of α, the supplier's payoff function, stated in terms of r rather than $w = r + c$, is given by

$$u^s(r \mid \alpha) = r(q_1(w) + q_2(w)) \tag{5}$$

On the other hand, for the retailers it is not necessary to know the exact values of c and r and hence, from their point of view (2nd stage game), we keep the notation $w = r + c$. If the supplier doesn't know α (incomplete information case), then his payoff function will be

$$u^s(r) := \mathbb{E}u^s(r \mid \alpha) \tag{6}$$

the expectation taken with respect to the distribution of α.

To proceed with the formal two-stage game model, we recall that both the production/inventory capacities T_1 and T_2 of the retailers and the distribution of the demand parameter α are common knowledge of the three market participants. We then have,

Complete Information Case: The demand parameter α is realized and observed by both the supplier and the retailers[3]. Then, at stage 1, the supplier fixes his profit margin r and hence his price w. His strategy set

[3]Of course, this means that there is no randomness in α, so the description of α as a random variable is redundant in the complete information case. We use it just to give a common formal description of both the complete and the incomplete information case.

and payoff function are given by (4) and (5). At stage 2, based on the value of w, each competing retailer chooses the quantity $Q_i, i = 1, 2$ that he will release to the market by determining how much quantity t_i he will draw (at zero cost) from his inventory T_i and how much additional quantity q_i he will order (at price w) from the supplier. The strategy sets and payoff functions of the retailers are given by (2) and (3) respectively.

Incomplete Information Case: At stage 1, the supplier chooses r without knowing the true value of α. His strategy set remains the same but his payoff function is now given by (6). After r and hence $w = r + c$ is fixed, the demand parameter α is realized and along with the price w is observed by the retailers. Then we proceed to stage 2, which is identical to that of the Complete Information Case.

All the above are assumed to be common knowledge of the three players.

3 Subgame-perfect equilibria under complete information

At first we treat the case with no uncertainty on the side of the supplier about the demand parameter α. In subsections 3.1 and 3.2 we determine the subgame perfect equilibria of this two stage game.

3.1 Equilibrium strategies of the second stage

We begin with the intuitive observation that it is best for the retailers to produce up to their capacity constraints or equivalently to exhaust their inventories before ordering additional quantitites from the supplier at unit price w. For simplicity in the notation of Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 fix $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and let $T_i := T$. As above, $Q_i = t_i + q_i$.

Lemma 3.1. *Any strategy $s_i = (t_i, q_i) \in \tilde{S}^i$ with $t_i < T$ and $q_i > 0$ is strictly dominated by a strategy $s_i' = (t_i', q_i')$ with*

$$(t_i', q_i') = \begin{cases} (T, Q_i - T), & \text{if } Q_i \geq T \\ (Q_i, 0), & \text{if } Q_i < T \end{cases}$$

or equivalently by $(t_i', q_i') = (\min\{Q_i, T\}, (Q_i - T)^+)$.

Proof. Let $Q_i \geq T$. Then for any $s_j \in \tilde{S}^j$, (3) implies that $u^i\left(s_i, s_j\right) = u^i\left(s_i', s_j\right) + w(t_i - T)$. Since $t_i < T$, the result follows. Similarly, if $Q_i < T$, then for any $s_j \in \tilde{S}^j$, (3) implies that $u^i\left(s_i, s_j\right) = u^i\left(s_i', s_j\right) - wq_i$. □

Accordingly, we restrict attention to the strategies in

$$S^i = \left\{ (t_i, q_i) : 0 \leq t_i < \min\{\alpha, T\}, q_i = 0 \right\} \bigcup \left\{ (t_i, q_i) : T = \min\{\alpha, T\}, 0 \leq q_i \leq (\alpha - T)^+ \right\}$$

Figure 1a depicts the set S^i when $T < \alpha$ and Figure 1b when $T \geq \alpha$. As shown below, Lemma 3.1 considerably simplifies the maximization of $u^i\left(\cdot, s_j\right)$, since for any strategy s_j of retailer R_j, the maximum of $u^i\left(\cdot, s_j\right)$ will be attained at the bottom or right hand side boundary of the region $[0, \min\{\alpha, T\}] \times [0, (\alpha - T)^+]$. Moreover, Lemma 3.1 implies that when $\alpha \leq T$, retailer R_i will order no additional quantity from the supplier[4]. Although trivial, we may not exclude this case in general, since in Section 4 we consider α to be varying.

[4] In Proposition 3.3 we will see that in equilibirum retailer R_i will order no additional quantity if $\alpha \leq 3T$.



(a) $T < \alpha$ (b) $T \geq \alpha$

Figure 1: Retailers strategy set S^i.

Restricting attention to S^i for $i = 1, 2$, we obtain the best reply correspondences BR^1 and BR^2 of retailers R_1 and R_2 respectively. To proceed, we notice that the payoff of retailer $R_i, i = 1, 2$ depends on the total quantity Q_j that retailer R_j, $j = 3 - i$ releases to the market and not on the explicit values of t_j, q_j, cf. (3).

Lemma 3.2. *The best reply correspondence* BR^i *of retailer* R_i *for* $i = 1, 2$ *is given by*

$$\mathrm{BR}^i(Q_j) = \begin{cases} t_i = T, & q_i = \dfrac{\alpha - w - Q_j}{2} - T, \quad \textit{if } 0 \leq Q_j < \alpha - w - 2T & (1) \\ t_i = T, & q_i = 0, \quad \textit{if } \alpha - w - 2T \leq Q_j < \alpha - 2T & (2) \\ t_i = \dfrac{\alpha - Q_j}{2}, & q_i = 0, \quad \textit{if } \alpha - 2T \leq Q_j & (3) \end{cases}$$

The enumeration (1), (2), (3) of the different parts of the best reply correspondence will be used for a more clear case discrimination in the subsequent equilibrium analysis, see Appendix A.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

A generic graph of the best reply correspondence BR^1 of retailer R_1 to the total quantity Q_2 that retailer R_2 releases to the market is given in Figure 2. The equilibrium analysis of the second stage of the game proceeds in the standard way, i.e. with the identification of the Nash equilibria through the intersection of the best reply correspondences BR^1 and BR^2. For a better exposition of the results we restrict attention from now on to the case of identical retailers, i.e. $T_1 = T_2 = T$. The general case $T_1 \geq T_2$ is treated in Appendix A, where the complete statements and the proofs of Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.4 are provided.

If the retailers are identical, i.e. $T_1 = T_2 = T$ only symmetric equilibria may occur in the second stage. The equilibrium strategies depend on the value of α and its relative position to $3T$.

Proposition 3.3. *If* $T_1 = T_2 = T$*, then for all values of* α *the second stage equilibrium strategies between retailers* R_1 *and* R_2 *are symmetric and for* $i = 1, 2$ *they are given by* $s_i^*(w) = (t_i^*(w), q_i^*(w))$*, or shortly* $s_i^* = (t_i^*, q_i^*)$*, with*

$$t_i^*(w) = T - \frac{1}{3}(3T - \alpha)^+, \quad q_i^*(w) = \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - 3T - w)^+.$$



Figure 2: Best reply correspondence of Retailer R_1.

Proof. See Appendix A, where Proposition 3.3 is stated and proved for the general case $T_1 \geq T_2$. □

The quantity $Q_i^* = t_i^* + q_i^*$ is the total quantity of the good that each retailer releases to the market in equilibrium. If $\alpha \leq 3T$ then Q_i^* is equal to the equilibrium quantity of a classic Cournot duopolist who faces linear inverse demand with intercept equal to α and has 0 cost per unit. If $\alpha > 3T$, then the equilibrium quantities of the retailers depend on the supplier's price w. If w is low enough, i.e. if $w < \alpha - 3T$, they will be willing to order additional quantities from the supplier. In this case, $Q_i^* = t_i^* + q_i^* = T + \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - 3T - w) = \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - w)$, which is equal to the equilibrium quantity of a Cournot duopolist who faces linear demand with intercept equal to α and has w cost per unit for all product units, despite the fact that in our model the retailers face a cost of 0 for the first T units and w for the rest. Finally, for $w \geq \alpha - 3T$ the retailers will avoid ordering and will release their inventories to the market.

The total quantity that is released to the market has a direct impact on the consumers welfare as expressed in terms of the consumers surplus[5]. For lower values of the demand parameter the consumers benefit from the "low cost" inventories or production capacities of the retailers, since otherwise no goods would have been released to the market. On the other hand, for higher values of α the total quantity that is released to the market does not depend directly on T and thus the benefits from keeping inventory are eliminated for the consumers.

3.2 Equilibrium strategies of the first stage

The general form of the supplier's payoff function $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$ is given in (5) and his strategy set in (4). Obviously, the supplier will not be willing to charge prices lower than his cost c. Based on the discussion of

[5]We remind that the consumers surplus is proportional to the square of the total quantity that is released to the market.

Proposition 3.3 above and the constraint $w \geq c$ (i.e. $r \geq 0$), we conclude that a transaction will take place for values of $\alpha > 3T + c$ and for $r \in [0, \alpha - 3T - c)$. As we shall see, in that case, the optimal profit margin of the supplier is at the midpoint of the r-interval.

To see this, let $q^*(w) := q_1^*(w) + q_2^*(w)$ denote the total quantity that the supplier will receive as an order from the retailers when they respond optimally. By Proposition 3.3, $q^*(w) = \frac{2}{3}(\alpha - 3T - w)^+$. Hence, on the equilibrium path and for $r \geq 0$, the payoff of the supplier is

$$u^s(r \mid \alpha) = rq^*(w) = \frac{2}{3} r(\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+ \tag{7}$$

We then have

Proposition 3.4. *For $T_1 = T_2 = T$ and for all values of α, the subgame perfect equilibrium strategy $r^*(\alpha)$ of the supplier is given by*

$$r^*(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 3T - c)^+$$

Proof. See Appendix A, where Proposition 3.4 is stated and proved for the general case $T_1 \geq T_2$. □

Proposition 3.4 implies that if $\alpha < 3T + c$, then the optimal profit of the supplier is equal to 0, i.e. he will set a price equal to his cost. Actually, he is indifferent between any price $w \geq c$ since in that case he knows that the retailers will order no additional quantity.

In sum, Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.4 provide the subgame perfect equilibrium of the two stage game in the case of identical (i.e. $T_1 = T_2 = T$) retailers.

Theorem 3.5. *If the capacities of the producers (retailers) are identical, i.e. if $T_1 = T_2 = T$, then the complete information two stage game has a unique subgame perfect Nash equilibrium, under which the supplier sells with profit margin $r^*(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 3T - c)^+$ and each of the producers (retailers) orders quantity $q^*(w) = \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - 3T - w)^+$ and produces (releases from his inventory) quantity $t^*(w) = T - \frac{1}{3}(3T - \alpha)^+$.*

4 Subgame-perfect equilibrium under demand uncertainty

We investigate the equilibrium behavior of the supply chain assuming that the supplier has no information about the true value of the demand parameter α when he sets his price, while the retailers know it when they place their orders (if any). In the two stage game context, we assume that the demand is realized after the first stage (i.e. after the supplier sets his price) but prior to the second stage of the game (i.e. prior to the decision of the retailers about the quantity that they will release to the market). The case $T_1 \geq T_2$ exhibits significant computational difficulties and we will restrict our attention to the symmetric case $T_1 = T_2 = T$.

Under these assumptions the equilibrium analysis of the second stage (as presented in subsection 3.1) remains unaffected: the retailers observe the actual demand parameter α and the price w set by the supplier and choose the quantities t_i and q_i for $i = 1, 2$. However, in the first stage, the actual payoff of the supplier depends on the unknown parameter α for which he has a belief: the distribution F of α, which induces a non-atomic measure on $[0, \infty)$ with finite expectation, as assumed. Given the value of α and taking as granted that the retailers respond to the supplier's choice w with their unique equilibrium strategies, the supplier's

actual payoff is provided by equation (7). Taking the expectation with respect to his belief (see also (6)), we derive the payoff function of the supplier when α is unknown and distributed according to F

$$u^s(r) = \frac{2}{3} r \,\mathbb{E}(\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+ \quad \text{for } r \geq 0. \tag{8}$$

Let $r_H := \alpha_H - 3T - c$ and $r_L := \alpha_L - 3T - c$. If $r_H \leq 0$, then $\alpha \leq 3T + c$ for all α, i.e. then, $u^s(r) \equiv 0$ and the problem is trivial. Hence, in order to proceed we assume that $r_H > 0 \Leftrightarrow 3T + c < \alpha_H$. Then, since $u^s(r) = 0$ for $r \geq r_H$, we may restrict the domain of $u^s(r)$ and take it to be the interval $[0, r_H)$ in (8). Next, observe that since $(\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+$ is non-negative, $\mathbb{E}(\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+ = \int_0^\infty P((\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+ > y)\, dy$, [e.g. see Billingsley, 1986] and hence, by a simple change of variable, $\mathbb{E}(\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+ = \int_{3T+c+r}^\infty (1 - F(x))\, dx$ which implies that

$$u^s(r) = \frac{2}{3} r \int_{3T+c+r}^\infty (1 - F(x))\, dx \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r < r_H. \tag{9}$$

We are now able to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *The supplier's payoff function $u^s(r)$ is continuously differentiable on $(0, r_H)$ and*

$$\frac{du^s}{dr}(r) = \frac{2}{3} \int_{3T+c+r}^\infty (1 - F(x))\, dx - \frac{2}{3} r\,(1 - F(3T + c + r)). \tag{10}$$

Proof. It suffices to show that $\frac{d}{dr}\mathbb{E}(\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+ = -(1 - F(3T + c + r))$. Then, equation (10) as well as continuity are implied. So, let

$$K_h(\alpha) := -\frac{1}{h}\left[(\alpha - 3T - c - r - h)^+ - (\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+\right] \tag{11}$$

and take $h > 0$. Then, $K_h(\alpha) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha > 3T+c+r+h\}} + \frac{\alpha - 3T - c - r}{h} \mathbf{1}_{\{3T+c+r < \alpha \leq 3T+c+r+h\}}$ and therefore

$$\lim_{h \to 0+} K_h(\alpha) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha > 3T+c+r\}}$$

Since $0 \leq K_h(\alpha) \leq 1$ for all α, the dominated convergence theorem implies that

$$\lim_{h \to 0+} \mathbb{E}(K_h(\alpha)) = P(\alpha > 3T + c + r)$$

In a similar fashion, one may show that $\lim_{h \to 0-} \mathbb{E}(K_h(\alpha)) = P(\alpha \geq 3T + c + r)$. Since the distribution of α is non-atomic, $P(\alpha > 3T + c + r) = P(\alpha \geq 3T + c + r)$ and hence, $\lim_{h \to 0} \mathbb{E}(K_h(\alpha)) = 1 - F(3T + c + r)$. By Equation (11), $\lim_{h \to 0} \mathbb{E}(K_h(\alpha)) = -\frac{d}{dr}\mathbb{E}(\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+$, which concludes the proof.

□

At this point, we need to introduce the Mean Residual Lifetime function (MRL) of α. For a more thorough discussion of the definition and properties of $\mathrm{m}(\cdot)$ one is referred to applied probability books and papers–Hall and Wellner [1981] or Guess and Proschan [1988] are considered classic. It is given by

$$\mathrm{m}(t) := \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}(\alpha - t \mid \alpha > t) & \text{if } P(\alpha > t) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = \begin{cases} \frac{\int_t^\infty (1 - F(x))\, dx}{1 - F(t)} & \text{if } P(\alpha > t) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Then, the following holds.

Lemma 4.2. *For $r \in (0, r_H)$, the supplier's payoff function and its derivative are expressed through the MRL function by $u^s(r) = \frac{2}{3} r \mathrm{m}(3T + c + r)(1 - F(3T + c + r))$ and*

$$\frac{du^s}{dr}(r) = \frac{2}{3}\left(\mathrm{m}(3T + c + r) - r\right)(1 - F(3T + c + r)) \tag{13}$$

respectively. In addition, the roots of $\frac{du^s}{dr}(r)$ in $(0, r_H)$ (if any) satisfy the fixed point equation

$$r^* = \mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c) \tag{14}$$

Proof. The formulas for $u^s(r)$ and $\frac{du^s}{dr}(r)$ are immediate using eq. (9), eq. (10), and eq. (12). As an interesting observation, notice that the two terms of $u^s(r)$, as given in the lemma, may not be separately differentiable. Finally, if $r \in (0, r_H)$, then $1 - F(3T + c + r)$ is positive. Hence, equation (13) implies that the critical points r^* of $u^s(r)$ (if any) satisfy $r^* = \mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)$. □

We remark that since $\mathbb{E}(\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+ = \mathrm{m}(3T + c + r)(1 - F(3T + c + r))$, one may be tempted to use the product rule to derive its derivative and hence show that $u^s(r)$ is differentiable. The problem is that the product rule does not apply, since the two terms in this expression of $\mathbb{E}(\alpha - 3T - c - r)^+$ may both be non-differentiable, even if α has a density and its support is connected (e.g. consider the point r_L in case $r_L > 0$).

Due to Lemma 4.2, if a non-zero optimal response of the supplier exists at equilibrium, it will be a critical point of $u^s(r)$, i.e. it will satisfy (14). It is easy to see that such a response always exists when the support of α is bounded, i.e. when $\alpha_H < \infty$. However, this is not the case when $\alpha_H = \infty$. So, let us determine conditions under which such a critical point exists, is unique and corresponds to a global maximum of the supplier's payoff function. To this end, we study the first term of (13), namely $g(r) := \mathrm{m}(r + 3T + c) - r$.

Clearly, $g(r)$ is continuous on $(0, r_H)$. We first show that $\lim_{r \to 0+} g(r) > 0$ by considering cases. If $r_L > 0$, then for $0 < r < r_L$, $\mathrm{m}(r + 3T + c) = \mathbb{E}(\alpha) - r - 3T - c$. Hence, $\lim_{r \to 0+} g(r) = \mathbb{E}(\alpha) - 3T - c > r_L > 0$. If $r_L \leq 0$, then we use Proposition 1f of Hall and Wellner [1981], according to which $\mathrm{m}(t) \geq (\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - t)^+$ with equality if and only if $F(t) = 0$ or $F(t) = 1$. So, take first $r_L < 0$, which implies $\alpha_L < 3T + c < \alpha_H$. Hence, $0 < F(3T + c) < 1$ and (by Proposition 1f) $\mathrm{m}(3T + c) > \mathbb{E}(\alpha - 3T - c)^+ \geq 0$. Hence, $\lim_{r \to 0+} g(r) > 0$ if $r_L < 0$. Finally, if $r_L = 0$, then $\mathrm{m}(3T + c) = \mathrm{m}(\alpha_L) = \mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L > 0$, which again implies that $\lim_{r \to 0+} g(r) > 0$.

We then examine the behavior of $g(r)$ near r_H. If $\alpha_H < +\infty$, then $\lim_{r \to r_H -} g(r) = -r_H < 0$ and by the intermediate value theorem an $r^* \in (0, r_H)$ exists such that $g(r^*) = 0$. For $\alpha_H < +\infty$, we also notice that to get uniqueness of the critical point r^*, it suffices to assume that the Mean Residual Lifetime (MRL) of the distribution of α is decreasing[6], in short that F has the DMRL property. On the other hand, if $\alpha_H = +\infty$, then the limiting behavior of $\mathrm{m}(r)$ as r increases to infinity may vary, see Bradley and Gupta [2003], and an optimal solution may not exist, see Example 4 below. But, if we assume as before that $\mathrm{m}(r)$ is decreasing, then $g(r)$ will eventually become negative and stay negative as r increases and hence, existence along with uniqueness of an r^* such that $g(r^*) = 0$ is again established.

Now, $1 - F(3T + c) > 0$ since $3T + c < \alpha_H$ and hence $\lim_{r \to 0+} \frac{du^s}{dr}(r) > 0$, i.e. $u^s(r)$ starts increasing on $(0, r_H)$. Assuming that F has the DMRL property, the first term of (13) is negative in a neighborhood of r_H

[6] We use the terms "decreasing" in the sense of "non-increasing" (i.e. flat spots are permitted), as they do in the pertinent literature, where this use of the term has been established.

while the second term goes to 0 from positive values. Hence, $\frac{du^s}{dr}(r) < 0$ in a neighborhood of r_H, i.e $u^s(r)$ is decreasing as r approaches r_H. Clearly, for ϵ sufficiently small, $u^s(r)$ will take a maximum in the interior of the interval $[\epsilon, r_H - \epsilon]$ if $r_H < \infty$ or a maximum in the interior of the interval $[\epsilon, \infty)$ if $r_H = \infty$. Since $u^s(r)$ is differentiable, the maximum will be attained at a critical point of $u^s(r)$, i.e. at the unique r^* given implicitly by (14).

Equation (14) actually characterizes r^* as the fixed point of a translation of the MRL function $\mathrm{m}(\cdot)$, namely of $\mathrm{m}(\cdot + 3T + c)$. Its evaluation sometimes has to be numeric, but in one interesting case it may be evaluated explicitly: If $r_L > 0$, then $\alpha - 3T - c > 0$ for all α, which implies that $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - 3T - c > 0$. Then, if

$$\frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - 3T - c) \leq r_L \,, \tag{15}$$

we get $r^* = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - 3T - c)$. To see this, notice that (15) is equivalent to $\mathrm{m}(\alpha_L) \leq r_L$, i.e. to

$$\mathrm{m}(r_L + 3T + c) \leq r_L$$

Then, by the DMRL property $\mathrm{m}(r + 3T + c) < r$ for all $r > r_L$. This implies that $r^* \leq r_L$ or equivalently that $r^* + 3T + c \leq \alpha_L$. In this case $\mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c) = \mathbb{E}(\alpha) - (r^* + 3T + c)$ and hence r^* will be given explicitly by

$$r^* = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - 3T - c) \,.$$

Intuitively, this special case occurs under the conditions that (a) the lower bound of the demand α_L exceeds the particular threshold $3T + c$, (i.e. $\alpha_L > 3T + c$ or $r_L > 0$), and (b) the expected excess of α over its lower bound α_L is at most equal to the excess of α_L over $3T + c$ (i.e. $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L \leq \alpha_L - 3T - c = r_L$). Of course, since $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L > 0$, condition (b) suffices. In that case, compare with the optimal r^* of the complete information case (Proposition 3.4).

Finally, if $r_L > 0$ and $\frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - 3T - c) > r_L$ (i.e, if $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) > r_L + \alpha_L$) we get that $r^* > r_L$, for if $r^* \leq r_L$, then $\mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c) \geq \mathrm{m}(\alpha_L)$, i.e. $r^* \geq \mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L$. The latter implies that then $r_L \geq \mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L$ which contradicts the assumption.

To sum up, we obtained that

Theorem 4.3 (Necessary and sufficient conditions for Bayesian Nash equilibria)**.** *Under incomplete information with identical producers/retailers (i.e. for $T_1 = T_2 = T$) for the non-trivial case $r_H > 0$ and assuming the supplier's belief induces a non-atomic measure on the demand parameter space:*
A. (necessary condition) *If the optimal profit margin r^* of the supplier exists when the producers/ retailers follow their equilibrium strategies in the second stage, then it satisfies the fixed point equation $r^* = \mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)$.*
B. (sufficient condition) *If the mean residual lifetime $\mathrm{m}(\cdot)$ of the demand parameter α is decreasing, then the optimal profit margin r^* of the supplier exists under equilibrium and it is the unique solution of the equation $r^* = \mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)$. In that case, if $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L \leq \alpha_L - 3T - c$ $(= r_L)$, then r^* is given explicitly by $r^* = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - 3T - c)$. Moreover, if $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L > \alpha_L - 3T - c$ $(= r_L)$, then $r^* \in (r_L^+, r_H)$.*

Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 4.3 lead to

Corollary 4.4. *If the capacities of the producers (retailers) are identical, i.e. if* $T_1 = T_2 = T$*, and if the distribution* F *of the demand intercept* α *is of decreasing mean residual lifetime* $\mathrm{m}(\cdot)$*, then the incomplete information two stage game has a unique subgame perfect Bayesian Nash equilibrium for the non-trivial case* $r_H > 0$*. At equilibrium, the supplier sells with profit margin* r^**, which is the unique solution of the fixed point equation* $r^* = \mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)$ *and each of the producers (retailers) orders quantity* $q^*(w) = \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - 3T - w)^+$ *and produces (releases from his inventory) quantity* $t^*(w) = T - \frac{1}{3}(3T - \alpha)^+$*.*

Theorem 4.3 enables one to show the intuitive result that under the DMRL assumption, if everything else stays the same but inventories of the retailers are rising (but staying below $(\alpha_H - c)/3$ because of the non-triviality assumption), the supplier will decrease strictly or keep constant the price he charges at equilibrium, because his profit margin r^* will be non-increasing. The reason is that as T increases, the graph of $\mathrm{m}(\cdot, T, c) := \mathrm{m}(\cdot + 3T + c)$ shifts to the left and therefore its intercept with the line bisecting the first quadrant decreases[7]. By Theorem 4.3, this intercept is r^* and hence the price $w^* = c + r^*$ the supplier asks at equilibrium will be decreasing. By the same argument, if we take the supplier's cost c to be increasing (but staying below $\alpha_H - 3T$) while everything else stays fixed, then the supplier's profit margin r^* will again be decreasing. However, this time the price $w^* = c + r^*$ the supplier asks at equilibrium will be increasing. To see this, let $c_1 < c_2$. Then, since $\mathrm{m}(\cdot)$ is decreasing, $r_2^* \leq r_1^*$. If $r_2^* = r_1^*$, then $w_1^* = r_1^* + c_1 < r_2^* + c_2 = w_2^*$. If $r_2^* < r_1^*$, by Theorem 4.3, $\mathrm{m}(r_2^* + 3T + c_2) < \mathrm{m}(r_1^* + 3T + c_1)$. The DMRL property then implies that $r_1^* + c_1 \leq r_2^* + c_2$), i.e. $w_2^* \geq w_1^*$. So, we proved that

Corollary 4.5. *Under the DMRL property: (a) If everything else stays the same and the inventory quantity of the retailers* T *increases in the interval* $[0, (\alpha_H - c)/3)$*, then at equilibrium, the supplier's profit margin* r^**, and hence the price* $w^* = c + r^*$ *he asks, both decrease. (b) If everything else stays the same and the cost of the supplier* c *increases in the interval* $[0, \alpha_H - 3T)$*, then at equilibrium, the supplier's profit margin* r^* *decreases while the price* w^* *he asks increases.*

We close this section with some remarks and observations.

(a) By the DMRL property, Theorem 4.3 implies that $r^* \leq \mathbb{E}(\alpha)$, since

$$r^* = \mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c) \leq \mathrm{m}(u) \leq \mathrm{m}(0) = \mathbb{E}(\alpha) \quad \text{for all } u \text{ such that } \quad 0 \leq u \leq r^* + 3T + c\,. \tag{16}$$

(b) A sufficient condition for the mean residual lifetime to be decreasing is that F is absolutely continuous (i.e. has a density) and is of increasing failure rate (IFR). The fact that the IFR assumption on F yields the desired properties for the critical point r^* can also be seen by taking the second derivative of $u^s(r)$, which one may check that is given by

$$\frac{d^2u^s}{dr^2}(r) = \frac{2}{3}\left(r\mathrm{h}(r + 3T + c) - 2\right)\left(1 - F(r + 3T + c)\right)\,, \tag{17}$$

and studying the behavior of $\frac{du^s}{dr}(r)$ through $\frac{d^2u^s}{dr^2}(r)$. If the IFR property applies, then finiteness of every moment of F, in particular of the expectation $\mathbb{E}(\alpha)$ is implied, so that this does not have to be explicitly assumed (cf. assumption 5 in Section 2).

[7] To avoid confusion, we use the terms "decreases" in the sense "decreases non-strictly" or "does not increase", as we had to do before.

(c) If α has a density, then by the explicit form of the second derivative, the weaker assumption that $r\mathrm{h}(r+c+3T)$ is increasing would suffice under the additional assumption that the term $r\mathrm{h}(r+c+3T)$ exceeds 2. This is always the case if $\alpha_H < +\infty$, since then $\lim_{r\to r_H-} \mathrm{h}(r) = +\infty$, but has to be assumed if $\alpha_H = +\infty$. Lariviere and Porteus [2001] and Lariviere [2006] introduce and examine a similar condition, the *increasing generalized failure rate (IGFR)*. Specifically, F has the IGFR property if $r\mathrm{h}(r)$ is increasing. However, the assumption that $r\mathrm{h}(r)$ is increasing does not imply in general that $r\mathrm{h}(r+k)$, for some constant $k \in \mathbb{R}$, is also increasing and therefore, assuming that F is of IGFR would not suffice in our model to ensure existence of a solution in the unbounded support case.

(d) Finally, we note that a necessary and sufficient condition for F to be of DMRL is that the integral

$$H(t) := \int_t^{\alpha_H} (1 - F(\alpha))\, d\alpha$$

is log-concave, see Bagnoli and Bergstrom [2005].

4.1 Classic Cournot with no production capacities and a single supplier

If $T = 0$, then our model corresponds to a classic Cournot duopoly at which the retailers' cost equals the price that is set by a single profit maximizing supplier. In this case, we may normalize c to 0 (now the non-negative assumption on α implies that $\alpha_L > c$) and the first derivative of $u^s(r)$, see (14), simplifies to

$$\frac{du^s}{dr}(r) = \frac{2}{3}(\mathrm{m}(r) - r)(1 - F(r)) .$$

Thus, cf. (14), the unique - under the DMRL assumption - critical point of $u^s(r)$ now satisfies $r^* = \mathrm{m}(r^*)$, i.e. the optimal profit margin r^* of the supplier is the unique fixed point of the mean residual lifetime function. So we have,

Corollary 4.6. [A Cournot supply chain with demand uncertainty for the supplier] *Consider a market with a linear inverse demand function for a single product distributed by two retailers without inventories, who order the quantities they will release to the market from a single supplier, who sells at a common price. Assume that the supplier doesn't know the actual value of the demand intercept α but has a belief about it, expressed by a probability distribution function F. Then, under the assumption that F is of decreasing mean residual lifetime* $\mathrm{m}(\cdot)$ *and the supplier's cost is below all values of α, the supply chain formed by the supplier and the retailers has a unique Bayesian Nash equilibrium. At equilibrium and after normalizing the supplier's cost to 0, the supplier sells at a price $w^* = r^*$, which is the unique fixed point of* $\mathrm{m}(\cdot)$ *and each of the producers (retailers) orders quantity $q^*(w) = \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - w)^+$.*

Remark 1. In case $T = 0$, the second derivative of the supplier's payoff, see (17), is simplified to

$$\frac{d^2u^s}{dr^2}(r) = \frac{2}{3}(r\mathrm{h}(r) - 2)(1 - F(r))$$

so that now the assumption that F has the IGFR property, i.e. that $r\mathrm{h}(r)$ is increasing, is sufficient to ensure existence of a unique solution, if one additionally assumes that the term $r\mathrm{h}(r)$ exceeds 2. Note that in that case, r^* will still be a fixed point of $\mathrm{m}(r)$, as it will have to be a root of $\frac{du^s}{dr}(r)$. Example 4 of Section 6 deals with such a case, where $\mathrm{m}(r)$ is not a decreasing function.

5 Inefficiency of equilibrium in the incomplete information case

It is well known that markets with incomplete information may be inefficient in equilibrium in the sense that trades that would be beneficial for all players may not occur under Bayesian Nash equilibrium, eg. see Myerson and Satterthwaite [1983]. In this section, we discuss the inefficiency exhibited by the Bayesian Nash equilibrium we derived for the incomplete information case of our chain. By inefficiency we mean that, under equilibrium, there exist values of α for which a transaction would have occurred in the complete information case but will not occur in the incomplete information case. Inefficiency *should not* be interpreted as a comparison between the actual payments of market participants in the complete and in the incomplete information case for various realizations of α.

So, for the incomplete information case and for a particular distribution F of α, let U be the event that a transaction would have occurred under equilibrium, if we had been in the complete information case, and let V be the event that a transaction does not occur in the incomplete information case under equilibrium. Our aim is to measure the inefficiency of our market by studying $P(V \cap U)$ and $P(V \mid U)$.

By Proposition 3.3, a transaction will take place under equilibrium if and only if

$$\alpha > r^* + 3T + c \tag{18}$$

where r^* stands for the profit margin of the supplier in the incomplete information case under equilibrium. Using (18) and Proposition 3.4, we conclude that a necessary and sufficient condition for a transaction to take place under equilibrium in the complete information case is $\alpha > 3T + c$. Hence, using S for the support of F, we get $U = \{\alpha \mid \alpha \in S \text{ and } \alpha > 3T + c\}$ and $V = \{\alpha \mid \alpha \in S \text{ and } \alpha \leq r^* + 3T + c\}$. So, $V \cap U = \{\alpha \mid \alpha \in S \text{ and } 3T + c < \alpha \leq r^* + 3T + c\}$, and therefore $P(V \cap U) = F(r^* + 3T + c) - F(3T + c)$ and

$$P(V \mid U) = \frac{F(r^* + 3T + c) - F(3T + c)}{1 - F(3T + c)}$$

In order both to clarify things and to be able to check that the MRL function $\mathrm{m}(\cdot)$ is non-zero at certain points of later interest, but also because it is needed for the discussion at the end of this section, let us see the cases that may occur. Using Theorem 4.3 and the steps at the end of its proof, it is straightforward to check that if $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L \leq r_L$, then (18) is satisfied for all $\alpha > \alpha_L$ since the ordering is $3T + c < r^* + 3T + c \leq \alpha_L$. Hence $V \cap U = \emptyset$. So let us assume that $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L > r_L$. Then, by Theorem 4.3, the supplier will sell at $r^* \in (r_L^+, r_H)$ in equilibrium. So, there are two cases, either (a) $r_L > 0$ or (b) $r_L \leq 0$. In case (a), we get $3T + c < \alpha_L < r^* + 3T + c < \alpha_H$, hence $V \cap U = [\alpha_L, r^* + 3T + c] \cap S$. In case (b), $\alpha_L \leq 3T + c < r^* + 3T + c < \alpha_H$, hence $V \cap U = (3T + c, r^* + 3T + c] \cap S$ (notice that for $\alpha \leq 3T + c$ no transaction would have taken place under complete information also). So, we have proved that

Lemma 5.1. *For a given distribution F of α with the DMRL property, let V be the event that a transaction does not occur in the incomplete information case under equilibrium and let U be the event that a transaction would have occurred under equilibrium if we had been in the complete information case. Then, $P(V \cap U) = F(r^* + 3T + c) - F(3T + c)$ and $P(V \mid U) = \dfrac{F(r^* + 3T + c) - F(3T + c)}{1 - F(3T + c)}$. In particular, if $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L \leq \alpha_L - 3T - c$ $(= r_L)$, then $P(V \cap U) = P(V \mid U) = 0$.*

Our next aim is to obtain a robust upper bound for $P(V \mid U)$, i.e a bound independent of the distribution F. Firstly, we express the distribution function F in terms of the MRL function, e.g. see [Guess and Proschan, 1988], to get

$$1 - F(t) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(\alpha)}{\mathrm{m}(t)} \exp\left\{ - \int_0^t \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(u)}\, du \right\} \text{ for } 0 \leq t < \alpha_H \tag{19}$$

We will use the DMRL property, cf. (16), to derive an upper bound for $P(V \mid U)$. To this end, we use (19) first for $t = r^* + 3T + c$, then for $t = 3T + c$, and then, dividing the two equations (division by 0 is no danger, see the discussion preceding Lemma 5.1), we get

$$1 - F(r^* + 3T + c) = (1 - F(3T + c)) \frac{\mathrm{m}(3T + c)}{\mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)} \exp\left\{ - \int_{3T+c}^{r^*+3T+c} \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(u)} du \right\}.$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} P(V \cap U) &= 1 - F(3T + c) - (1 - F(r^* + 3T + c)) \\ &= (1 - F(3T + c)) \left(1 - \frac{\mathrm{m}(3T + c)}{\mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)} \exp\left\{ - \int_{3T+c}^{r^*+3T+c} \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(u)} du \right\} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$P(V \mid U) = 1 - \frac{\mathrm{m}(3T + c)}{\mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)} \exp\left\{ - \int_{3T+c}^{r^*+3T+c} \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(u)} du \right\}. \tag{20}$$

By inequality (16) for $3T + c \leq u \leq r^* + 3T + c$ and the monotonicity of the exponential function

$$\exp\left\{ - \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)} \int_{3T+c}^{r^*+3T+c} du \right\} \leq \exp\left\{ - \int_{3T+c}^{r^*+3T+c} \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(u)} du \right\}.$$

Using the fact that $r^* = \mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)$, the last inequality becomes

$$\exp\{-1\} \leq \exp\left\{ - \int_{3T+c}^{r^*+3T+c} \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(u)} du \right\}.$$

Substituting in (20) we derive the following upper bound for $P(V \mid U)$

$$P(V \mid U) \leq 1 - \frac{\mathrm{m}(3T + c)}{\mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c)} e^{-1}.$$

Since $\mathrm{m}(r^* + 3T + c) \leq \mathrm{m}(3T + c)$ by the DMRL property, the upper bound may be relaxed to

$$P(V \mid U) \leq 1 - e^{-1}. \tag{21}$$

This upper bound is robust in the sense that it is independent of the particular distribution F over the family of DMRL distributions of α. Surprisingly enough, it is also tight over all DMRL distributions of α, since it is attained by the exponential distribution, which thus is the least favorable as far as efficiency at equilibrium is concerned. It is also asymptotically attained by a parametric family of Beta distributions, see Example 2 and Example 3 below. So, we have proved that

Theorem 5.2. *For any distribution F of α with the DMRL property, the conditional probability $P(V \mid U)$ that a transaction does not occur under equilibrium in the incomplete information case, given that a transaction would have occurred under equilibrium if we had been in the complete information case, can not exceed the bound $1 - e^{-1}$. This bound is tight over all DMRL distributions, as it is attained by the exponential distribution.*

To gain more intuition about the reasons that make the supplier charge a price that runs a (sometimes) considerable risk of no transaction, although such a transaction would be beneficial for all market participants, recall the discussion preceding Lemma 5.1. To have $P(V \mid U) = 0$, the expectation restriction, $\mathbb{E}(a) \leq \alpha_L + r_L$, must apply. So, assume this restriction applies and keeping everything else the same (i.e. α_L, T and c), start moving probability mass to the right. Then, $\mathbb{E}(\alpha)$ will be increasing which results to the supplier's optimal profit margin, $r^* = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - 3T - c)$, increasing. So, there is a threshold for $\mathbb{E}(\alpha)$, namely $\alpha_L + r_L$ (where the supplier charges $r^* = r_L$), above which the supplier is willing to charge a price so high (i.e. above r_L) that he will run the risk of receiving no orders. Next, assume the expectation restriction applies and keeping T and c the same, start moving α_L to the left. Now, $\mathbb{E}(\alpha)$ will be decreasing, which results to the supplier's optimal profit margin, r^*, decreasing. However, since r_L will eventually become non-positive while $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L$ always stays positive, it is easy to see that again the same threshold applies for the expectation condition, i.e. eventually we will get $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) = \alpha_L + r_L$, the supplier will charge $r^* = r_L$ there, and for lower values of α_L inefficiencies will appear. In other words, for values of α_L below the threshold, although he is reducing his profit margin, the supplier is asking for a *relatively* high price (i.e. above r_L) and is willing to take the risk of no transaction. Finally, using similar arguments we can see that if we either increase the inventory level T of the retailers or the cost c of the supplier, all else being kept the same (see also Corollary 4.5), the same threshold applies for the appearance of inefficiencies.

6 Examples

To illustrate the results of Sections 4 and 5, we present some examples, in which, whenever $T = 0$, we have normalized c to 0. A list of probability distributions with the DMRL property can be found, among others, in Bagnoli and Bergstrom [2005, Tables 1 and 3].

Example 1. *Uniform distribution.*
Let $\alpha \sim U[\alpha_L, \alpha_H]$ with $0 \leq \alpha_L < \alpha_H$ and $T = 0$. Since

$$\mathrm{m}(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}(\alpha) - t & \text{if } -\infty < t \leq \alpha_L \\ \dfrac{\alpha_H - t}{2} & \text{if } \alpha_L < t \leq \alpha_H, \end{cases}$$

F has the DMRL property. Since, $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) = \dfrac{\alpha_L + \alpha_H}{2}$, by Theorem 4.3 the optimal strategy of the supplier is given by

$$r^* = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}(\alpha) & \text{if } \alpha_H \leq 3\alpha_L \\ \dfrac{1}{3}\alpha_H & \text{if } \alpha_H > 3\alpha_L. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, if $\alpha \sim U(1,2)$ then $r^* = \dfrac{3}{4}$, while if $\alpha \sim U(0,1)$ then $r^* = \dfrac{1}{3}$. In the first case a transaction takes place for any value of α, whereas in the second case, the probability of no transaction is $F(r^*) = \dfrac{1}{3}$.

A rather distinct example is the uniform distribution on two disconnected intervals, e.g.

$$f(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_{\{1 \leq x \leq 2\} \cup \{3 \leq x \leq 4\}}$$

It is left to the reader to check that this is not a DMRL distribution. However, we still get a unique r^* satisfying $r^* = \mathrm{m}(r^*)$ since $g(r) = \mathrm{m}(r) - r$ is strictly decreasing for all $r < 4$ and satisfies $g(0+) > 0$ and $g(4-) < 0$.

Example 2. *Exponential distribution.*
Let $\alpha \sim \exp(\lambda)$, i.e. $f(\alpha) = \lambda e^{-\lambda\alpha} 1_{\{0 \le \alpha < \infty\}}$, with $\lambda > 0$ and let $T \ge 0$. Since

$$\mathrm{m}(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{\lambda} - t & \text{if } -\infty < t \le 0 \\ \dfrac{1}{\lambda} & \text{if } 0 < t < \infty \end{cases}$$

F is of DMRL. By Theorem 4.3, the optimal strategy r^* of the supplier is independent of T, c and is given by $r^* = \dfrac{1}{\lambda}$. The conditional probability of no transaction $P(V \mid U)$ is also independent of T, c and equal to $1 - e^{-1}$ due to the memoryless property of the exponential distribution (i.e. $P(\alpha > s + t \mid \alpha > t) = P(\alpha > s)$). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} P(V \mid U) &= P(\alpha \le r^* + 3T + c \mid \alpha > 3T + c) = 1 - P(\alpha > r^* + 3T + c \mid \alpha > 3T + c) \\ &= 1 - P(\alpha > r^*) = F(1/\lambda) = 1 - e^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

implying that the inequality in (21) is tight over all DMRL distributions.

The next distribution is a special case of the beta distribution known also as the Kumaraswamy distribution, see Jones [2009].

Example 3. *Beta distribution.*
Let $T = 0$ and let $\alpha \sim Be(1, \lambda)$ with $\lambda > 1$, i.e. the pdf of α is given by $f(\alpha) = \lambda(1 - \alpha)^{\lambda - 1} 1_{\{0 < \alpha < 1\}}$. Then, for $0 \le \alpha < 1$, we have that $1 - F(\alpha) = (1 - \alpha)^{\lambda}$ and using the equivalent expression for the mean residual lifetime

$$\mathrm{m}(t) = \frac{\int_t^1 (1 - F(\alpha))\, d\alpha}{1 - F(t)} \quad \text{if } t < 1,$$

the MRL function can be calculated to be

$$\mathrm{m}(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{1 + \lambda} - t & \text{if } -\infty < t \le 0 \\ \dfrac{1 - t}{1 + \lambda} & \text{if } 0 < t < 1. \end{cases}$$

Once more, since the MRL function is decreasing, Theorem 4.3 applies and the optimal profit margin of the supplier will be $r^* = \dfrac{1}{\lambda + 2}$. Since, $T = 0$, we have that

$$P(V \mid U) = F(r^*) = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\lambda + 2}\right)^{\lambda} \overset{\lambda \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} 1 - e^{-1}.$$

This example shows that our upper bound of $P(V \mid U)$ is still tight over distributions with strictly decreasing MRL, i.e. it is not the flatness of the exponential MRL that generated the large inefficiency.

Finally, the Pareto distribution provides an example of a distribution for which no optimal solution exists for the supplier. This distribution has the IGFR property, but not the DMRL property.

Example 4. *Pareto distribution.*

Let α be Pareto distributed with pdf $f(\alpha) = \dfrac{k\alpha_L^k}{\alpha^{k+1}}$ for $\alpha \geq \alpha_L > 0$, where $k > 1$ is a constant (for $0 < k \leq 1$ we get $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) = +\infty$, which contradicts the basic assumptions of our model). To simplify, let $\alpha_L = 1$, so that $f(\alpha) = k\alpha^{-k-1}1_{\{1\leq\alpha<\infty\}}$, $F(\alpha) = \left(1-\alpha^{-k}\right)1_{\{1\leq\alpha<\infty\}}$ and $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) = \dfrac{k}{k-1}$. Then, the mean residual lifetime of α is given by

$$\mathrm{m}(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{k}{k-1} - t & \text{if } -\infty < t \leq 1 \\ \dfrac{t}{k-1} & \text{if } t > 1. \end{cases}$$

and hence it is increasing on $[1, \infty)$, so that Theorem 4.3 does not apply. Notice that for $1 \leq r$ the failure (hazard) rate $\mathrm{h}(r) = kr^{-1}$ is decreasing, but the generalized failure rate $r\mathrm{h}(r) = k$ is constant and hence F is of IGFR. Assuming that T was taken to be 0 and that c was also normalized to 0, the payoff function of the supplier is

$$u^s(r) = \frac{2}{3}r\,\mathrm{m}(r)\left(1-F(r)\right) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{2}{3}r\left(\dfrac{k}{k-1} - r\right) & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq 1 \\ \dfrac{2}{3(k-1)}r^{2-k} & \text{if } r > 1, \end{cases}$$

which diverges as $r \to +\infty$ if we take $k < 2$ (also, notice that the second moment of α is infinite for $1 < k < 2$, which sheds light to the pathology of this example). Now, let us recall the remark after Corollary 4.6. Then, we see that for F being of IGFR, the assumption that the generalized failure rate $r\mathrm{h}(r)$ must exceed 2 may not be dropped if we want to guarantee a solution. On the other hand, in our example and for $k > 2$, we get a unique solution as expected, namely $r^* = \dfrac{k}{2(k-1)}$, which is indeed the unique fixed point of $\mathrm{m}(r)$.

7 General case with n identical retailers

The results of the previous sections admit a straightforward extension to the case of $n > 2$ identical retailers, i.e. n retailers each having capacity constraint $T_i = T$. Formally, let $N = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, with $n \geq 2$ and denote with R_i retailer i, for $i \in N$. As in Section 2, a strategy profile is denoted with $s = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$. The payoff function of R_i depends on the total quantity of the remaining $n-1$ retailers and is given by (3), where now Q denotes the total quantity sold by all n retailers, i.e.

$$Q = \sum_{j=1}^{n} Q_j = \sum_{j=1}^{n}(t_j + q_j)$$

Following common notation, let $s = (s_{-i}, s_i)$ and $Q_{-i} = Q - Q_i$ for $i \in N$. It is immediate that Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 still apply, if one replaces Q_j with Q_{-i} and s_j with s_{-i}. Hence, one may generalize Proposition 3.3 as follows

Proposition 7.1. *If $T_i = T$ for $i \in N$, then for all values of α the strategies $s_i^*(w) = (t_i^*(w), q_i^*(w))$, or shortly $s_i^* = (t_i^*, q_i^*)$, with*

$$t_i^*(w) = T - \frac{1}{n+1}\left((n+1)T - \alpha\right)^+, \quad q_i^*(w) = \frac{1}{n+1}\left(\alpha - (n+1)T - w\right)^+$$

are second stage equilibrium strategies among the retailers R_i, for $i \in N$.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Turning attention to the first stage, the payoff function of the supplier in the complete information case (cf. Subsection 3.2) will be given by $u^s(r) = rq^*(w) = \frac{n}{n+1} r\left(\alpha - (n+1)T - c - r\right)^+$ and hence it is maximized at

$$r^*(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\alpha - (n+1)T - c\right)^+$$

which generalizes Proposition 3.4. Similarly, if the supplier knows only the distribution and not the true value of α, the arguments of Section 4 still apply. Then, the payoff function of the supplier - cf. (8) - becomes

$$u^s(r) = \frac{n}{n+1} r\,\mathbb{E}\left(\alpha - (n+1)T - c - r\right)^+ \quad \text{for } r \geq 0.$$

and hence

$$u^s(r) = \frac{n}{n+1} r\,\mathrm{m}\left(r + (n+1)T + c\right)\left(1 - F\left(r + (n+1)T + c\right)\right) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r < \alpha_H - (n+1)T - c.$$

Proceeding as in Subsection 3.2, we may generalize Theorem 4.3 to the case of $n \geq 2$ identical retailers. To this end, let $r_L^n := \alpha_L - (n+1)T - c$ and $r_H^n := \alpha_H - (n+1)T - c$. Then,

Theorem 7.2 (Necessary and sufficient conditions for Bayesian Nash equilibria)**.** *Under incomplete information, for identical producers/retailers (i.e. for $T_i = T$, $i \in N$) for the non-trivial case $r_H^n > 0$ and assuming the supplier's belief induces a non-atomic measure on the demand parameter space:*
A. (necessary condition) *If the optimal profit margin r^* of the supplier exists when the producers/ retailers follow their equilibrium strategies in the second stage, then it satisfies the fixed point equation $r^* = \mathrm{m}\left(r^* + (n+1)T + c\right)$.*
B. (sufficient condition) *If the mean residual lifetime $\mathrm{m}(\cdot)$ of the demand parameter α is decreasing, then the optimal profit margin r^* of the supplier exists under equilibrium and it is the unique solution of the equation $r^* = \mathrm{m}\left(r^* + (n+1)T + c\right)$. In that case, if $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L \leq \alpha_L - (n+1)T - c$ $(= r_L^n)$, then r^* is given explicitly by $r^* = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - (n+1)T - c\right)$. Moreover, if $\mathbb{E}(\alpha) - \alpha_L > \alpha_L - (n+1)T - c\,(= r_L^n)$, then $r^* \in \left((r_L^n)^+, r_H^n\right)$.*

The results of Subsection 4.1 and Section 5 may be generalized in a similar manner.

A Appendix: General statements and proofs

A.1 Equilibrium strategies of the second stage

Proof of Lemma 3.2. For convenience in notation we will give the proof for $i = 1$ and $j = 2$ which results in no loss of generality due to symmetry of the retailers. Let $w \geq c$ and $s_2 = (t_2, q_2) \in S^2$ with $Q_2 = t_2 + q_2$. Restricting ourselves firstly to strategies with $q_1 = 0$, we have that

$$u^1((t_1, 0), s_2) = t_1(\alpha - Q_2 - t_1)$$

Let $t_1^* = \arg\max_{0 \leq t_1 \leq T} u^1((t_1, 0), s_2)$. Since $\alpha - Q_i \geq 0,\ i = 1, 2$, we have that if $\alpha - 2T \leq Q_2$, then $t_1^* = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - Q_2)$ while if $\alpha - 2T > Q_2$, then the maximum of $u^1((t_1, 0), s_2)$ is attained at the highest admissible (due to the production capacity constraint) value of t_1 and hence $t_1^* = T$. Similarly, for strategies with $t_1 = T$ and $q_1 > 0$ we have that the payoff function of retailer R_1

$$u^1((T, q_1), s_2) = Q_1(\alpha - w - Q_2 - Q_1) + Tw = T(\alpha - Q_2 - T) + q_1(\alpha - w - 2T - Q_2 - q_1)$$

is maximized at $q_1^* = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - w - 2T - Q_2)$ under the constraint that $q_1^* > 0$ or equivalently $Q_2 < \alpha - w - 2T$. If instead $q_1^* \leq 0$, then the maximum of $u^1((T, q_1), s_2)$ is attained at the lowest admissible value of q_1 i.e. $q_1 = 0$. Since conditions $\alpha - 2T \leq Q_2$ and $Q_2 < \alpha - w - 2T$ cannot apply at the same time, the result obtains. □

From the explicit form of the best reply correspondence that is given in Lemma 3.2 (see also Figure 2), it is straightforward that the equilibrium strategies depend on the values of α and w and their relation to T_1, T_2. For convenience we will denote with Γ_{ij} the case that the equilibrium occurs as an intersection of parts i, j for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$. Since by assumption $T_1 \geq T_2$, only the cases with $i \geq j$ (instead of all possible 9 cases) may occur.

Proposition A.1 (Complete statement of Proposition 3.3)**.** *Given the values of α and w, the second stage equilibrium strategies between retailers R_1 and R_2 for all possible values of $T_1 \geq T_2$ are given by*

		Equilibrium Strategies			
Case	***α is in***	t_1^*	q_1^*	t_2^*	q_2^*
Γ_{11}	$(3T_1 + w, \infty)$	T_1	$\frac{\alpha - w}{3} - T_1$	T_2	$\frac{\alpha - w}{3} - T_2$
Γ_{21}	$(\max\{3T_1 - w, T_1 + 2T_2 + w\}, 3T_1 + w]$	T_1	0	T_2	$\frac{\alpha - w - T_1}{2} - T_2$
Γ_{22}	$(2T_1 + T_2, T_1 + 2T_2 + w]$	T_1	0	T_2	0
Γ_{31}	$(3T_2 + 2w, 3T_1 - w]$	$\frac{\alpha + w}{3}$	0	T_2	$\frac{\alpha - 2w}{3} - T_2$
Γ_{32}	$(3T_2, \min\{2T_1 + T_2, 3T_2 + 2w\}]$	$\frac{\alpha - T_2}{2}$	0	T_2	0
Γ_{33}	$[0, 3T_2]$	$\frac{\alpha}{3}$	0	$\frac{\alpha}{3}$	0

Table 1: Second stage equilibrium strategies for all $T_1 \geq T_2$.

The second stage equilibria regions in the $T_1 - T_2$ plane are depicted in Figure 3.

Proof. The proof proceeds by examining under what conditions a second stage equilibrium occurs as an intersection of parts $i, j = (1), (2), (3)$ of the best reply correspondences of the retailers.

Case Γ_{11}. In this case the best reply correspondences intersect in their parts denoted by (1). By rearranging part (1) of the best reply correspondence in Lemma 3.2 and assuming that R_i replies optimally to R_j for $i, j = 1, 2$, we obtain that the total quantities released to the market under equilibrium will be given by $Q_1^* = Q_2^* = \dfrac{\alpha - w}{3}$ subject to the constraints $Q_2^* < \alpha - w - 2T_1$ and $Q_1^* < \alpha - w - 2T_2$. Substituting the values Q_1^* and Q_2^* in the constraints we find that these solutions are acceptable if $\dfrac{\alpha - w}{3} < \alpha - w - 2T_1$ and $\dfrac{\alpha - w}{3} < \alpha - w - 2T_2$ or equivalently if $\max\{T_1, T_2\} < \dfrac{\alpha - w}{3}$ which may be reduced to $T_1 < \dfrac{\alpha - w}{3}$ since $T_2 \leq T_1$ is assumed. Combining the above relations and decomposing Q_i^* as in Lemma 3.2 we obtain the first line of Table 1 that settles case Γ_{11}. Similarly,

Case Γ_{21}. Now, $Q_1^* = T_1$ and $Q_2^* = \dfrac{\alpha - w - T_1}{2}$ subject to $\alpha - w - 2T_1 \leq \dfrac{\alpha - w - T_1}{2} < \alpha - 2T_1$ and $0 \leq T_1 < \alpha - w - 2T_2$. Solving the constraints, yields $\max\{T_1 + T_2 + w, 3T_1 - w\} < \alpha \leq 3T_1 + w$.

Case Γ_{22}. Now, $Q_i^* = T_i$, for $i = 1, 2$. These strategies are acceptable if $\alpha - w - 2T_1 \leq T_2 < \alpha - 2T_1$ and $\alpha - w - 2T_2 \leq T_1 < \alpha - 2T_2$ which gives $2T_1 + T_2 < \alpha \leq T_1 + 2T_2 + w$.

Case Γ_{31}. Now, $Q_1^* = \dfrac{\alpha - Q_2^*}{2}$ and $Q_2^* = \dfrac{\alpha - w - Q_1^*}{2}$. Hence, $Q_1^* = \dfrac{\alpha + w}{3}$ and $Q_2^* = \dfrac{\alpha - 2w}{3}$ subject to $\alpha - 2T_1 \leq \dfrac{\alpha - 2w}{3}$ and $0 \leq \dfrac{\alpha + w}{3} < \alpha - w - 2T_2$ or equivalently $3T_2 + 2w < \alpha \leq 3T_1 - w$.

Case Γ_{32}. It is easy to see that $Q_1^* = \dfrac{\alpha - T_2}{2}$ and $Q_2^* = T_2$ subject to $\alpha - 2T_1 \leq T_2$ and $\alpha - w - 2T_2 \leq \dfrac{\alpha - T_2}{2} < \alpha - 2T_2$, which yields $3T_2 < \alpha \leq 3T_2 + 2w$. Finally,

Case Γ_{33}. $Q_1^* = Q_2^* = \dfrac{\alpha}{3}$ subject to $\alpha - 2T_1 \leq \dfrac{\alpha}{3}$ and $\alpha - 2T_2 \leq \dfrac{\alpha}{3}$ or equivalently $\alpha \leq 3T_2$.

□

One should notice that the conditions under which the cases Γ_{ij} (second column of Table 1) apply are mutually exclusive, hence there exists a unique second stage equilibrium. In more detail, if $T_1 > T_2$, exactly one of the following two mutually exclusive arrangements of the α-intervals will obtain: Either (a) $0 < 3T_2 < 2T_1 + T_2 < T_1 + 2T_2 + w < 3T_1 + w < \infty$ with case Γ_{31} empty or (b) $0 < 3T_2 < 3T_2 + 2w < 3T_1 - w < 3T_1 + w < \infty$ with case Γ_{22} empty. If $T_1 = T_2$, then (a) obtains and the α-intervals simplify to $0 < 3T < 3T + w < \infty$. Also, the retailers' equilibrium strategies are continuous at the cutting points of the α-intervals, i.e. the "α *is in*" intervals of Table 1 can be taken as left hand side closed also. Generically, in the $T_1 - T_2$ plane, the result of Proposition A.1 is summarized in Figure 3.



Figure 3: Second stage equilibria regions in the $T_1 - T_2$ plane.

The boundaries of the different regions in Figure 3 (or equivalently the conditions in Table 1) depend on the values of both w and α. However, the point $\frac{\alpha}{3}$ on both the T_1 and the T_2 axes and the line $\alpha = 2T_1 + T_2$ that separates the cases Γ_{22} and Γ_{32} depend only on the value of α and not on w. Thus, they will serve as a basis for case discrimination when solving for the optimal strategy of the supplier in the first stage.

A.2 Equilibrium strategies of the first stage

Based on Figure 3 (or equivalently on Table 1) and using equation (5), we can calculate the payoff function, $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$, of the supplier as α varies, when the retailers use their equilibrium strategies at the second stage. To proceed, we denote with $q^*_{ij}(w) := q^*_1(w) + q^*_2(w)$ the total quantity that the retailers order from the supplier when case Γ_{ij} for $j \le i \in \{1,2,3\}$ occurs in the second stage. By Table 1 above

$$
\begin{aligned}
q^*_{31}(w) &= \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - 2w - 3T_2), && \text{if } 3T_2 + 2w < \alpha \le 3T_1 - w \\
q^*_{21}(w) &= \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - w - T_1 - 2T_2), && \text{if } \max\{3T_1 - w, T_1 + 2T_2 + w\} < \alpha \le 3T_1 + w \\
q^*_{11}(w) &= \frac{2}{3}\left(\alpha - w - \frac{3}{2}T_1 - \frac{3}{2}T_2\right), && \text{if } 3T_1 + w < \alpha \\
q^*_{ij}(w) &= 0, && \text{else}
\end{aligned}
$$

and since $w = r + c$, with $c > 0$ being a constant and $r \geq 0$ being the strategic variable, the payoff function of the supplier may be written as

$$u^s(r \mid \alpha) = r \cdot \begin{cases} q_{31}^*(r+c), & 3T_2 + 2c + 2r < \alpha \leq 3T_1 - c - r \\ q_{21}^*(r+c), & \max\{3T_1 - c - r, T_1 + 2T_2 + c + r\} < \alpha \leq 3T_1 + c + r \\ q_{11}^*(r+c), & 3T_1 + c + r < \alpha \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

for $r \geq 0$, assuming that a subgame perfect equilibrium is played in the second stage. Re-arranging the conditions in the last column and taking into account the continuity of $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$ at the cutting points of the α-intervals and the non-negativity constraint for r, we obtain that

$$u^s(r \mid \alpha) = r \cdot \begin{cases} q_{31}^*(r+c), & 0 \leq r \leq \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 2c - 3T_2), 3T_1 - c - \alpha\right\} \\ q_{21}^*(r+c), & \max\{0, \alpha - c - 3T_1, 3T_1 - c - \alpha\} \leq r \leq \alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2 \\ q_{11}^*(r+c), & 0 \leq r < \alpha - c - 3T_1 \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

It is immediate that some cases may not occur for different values of the parameters. Hence, in order to derive the optimal strategy r^* of the supplier (see the proof of Proposition A.2 below), a further case discrimination is necessary. As we have already noted in the previous paragraph, the relative position of α to the quantities $3T_1, 3T_2$ and $2T_1 + T_2$ will serve as a basis for case discrimination. Maximizing the payoff function of the supplier for each case yields his optimal strategy r^* (i.e. the profit margin that maximizes his profits given that the retailers will play their equilibrium strategies in the next stage) for all possible values of α and T_1, T_2. The optimal values r^* are denoted by r_{ij}^*, $j \leq i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, according to the equilibrium that is played in the second stage. It will be convenient to discriminate two cases, **A** and **B**, depending on whether $0 < c \leq T_1 - T_2$ or $T_1 - T_2 < c$. Also, as mentioned above, the second stage equilibrium quantities are continuous at the points where their expression changes and therefore we allow the subsequent cases to overlap on the cutting points.

Finally, to simplify the expressions below, let $S := T_1 + T_2,\ D := T_1 - T_2,\ \Delta := \dfrac{\sqrt{3}+3}{2} D.$

Proposition A.2 (Complete statement of Proposition 3.4)**.** *For given $T_1 \geq T_2$, the optimal strategy r^* of the supplier for all possible values of α is given by*

Case A. $0 < c \leq D$

$$r^*(\alpha) = \begin{cases} r \in \mathbb{R}_+, & 0 \leq \alpha \leq 3T_2 + 2c \\ r_{31}^* = \dfrac{1}{4}(\alpha - 2c - 3T_2), & 3T_2 + 2c \leq \alpha \leq 3T_2 + \Delta - \dfrac{\sqrt{3}-1}{2}c \\ r_{21}^* = \dfrac{1}{2}(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2), & 3T_2 + \Delta - \dfrac{\sqrt{3}-1}{2}c \leq \alpha \leq 3T_2 + 2\Delta + c \\ r_{11}^* = \dfrac{1}{2}\left(\alpha - c - \dfrac{3}{2}T_1 - \dfrac{3}{2}T_2\right), & 3T_2 + 2\Delta + c \leq \alpha \end{cases}$$

Case B. $0 \le D < c$

$$r^*(\alpha) = \begin{cases} r \in \mathbb{R}_+, & 0 \le \alpha \le T_1 + 2T_2 + c \\ r^*_{21} = \dfrac{1}{2}(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2), & T_1 + 2T_2 + c \le \alpha \le 3T_2 + 2\Delta + c \\ r^*_{11} = \dfrac{1}{2}\left(\alpha - c - \dfrac{3}{2}T_1 - \dfrac{3}{2}T_2\right), & 3T_2 + 2\Delta + c \le \alpha \end{cases}$$

Proof. **Case A.** Let $0 < c \le D$. Then, $3T_2 + 2c \le T_1 + 2T_2 + c \le 2T_1 + T_2 \le 3T_1 - c \le 3T_1 + c$ and hence for the different values of α we have

A1. $0 \le \alpha \le 3T_2 + 2c$. For all $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we have that $u^s(r \mid \alpha) \equiv 0$ and hence $r^* = r \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

A2. $3T_2 + 2c \le \alpha \le 2T_1 + T_2$. The supplier's payoff function is given by

$$u^s(r \mid \alpha) = r \cdot \begin{cases} q^*_{31}(r + c), & 0 \le r \le \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - 2c - 3T_2) \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and hence, as a quadratic polynomial in r, it's first part is maximized at $r^* = r^*_{31}$.

A3. $2T_1 + T_2 \le \alpha \le 3T_1 - c$. Now

$$u^s(r \mid \alpha) = r \cdot \begin{cases} q^*_{31}(r + c), & 0 \le r \le 3T_1 - c - \alpha \\ q^*_{21}(r + c), & 3T_1 - c - \alpha \le r \le \alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2 \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

As quadratic polynomials in r, the first part is maximized at r^*_{31} and the second at r^*_{21}. It is easy to see that $0 \le r^*_{31} \le r^*_{21} \le \alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2$. Hence, in order to determine the maximum of $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$ with respect to r we distinguish three sub-cases.

A3.1. $0 \le r^*_{31} \le r^*_{21} \le 3T_1 - c - \alpha$. Then the overall maximum of $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$ is attained at r^*_{31}. The inequality $r^*_{21} \le 3T_1 - c - \alpha$ holds iff $\dfrac{1}{2}(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2) \le 3T_1 - c - \alpha \Leftrightarrow \alpha \le \dfrac{3}{2}S + \dfrac{5}{6}D - \dfrac{1}{3}c$.

A3.2. $3T_1 - c - \alpha \le r^*_{31} \le r^*_{21}$. Then the overall maximum of $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$ is attained at r^*_{21}. The inequality $3T_1 - c - \alpha \le r^*_{31}$ holds iff $3T_1 - c - \alpha \le \dfrac{1}{4}(\alpha - 2c - 3T_2) \Leftrightarrow \alpha \ge \dfrac{3}{2}S + \dfrac{9}{10}D - \dfrac{2}{5}c$.

A3.3. $0 \le r^*_{31} \le 3T_1 - c - \alpha \le r^*_{21}$. In this case we need to compare the payoffs $u^s\left(r^*_{31} \mid \alpha\right)$ and $u^s(r^*_{21} \mid \alpha)$. The overall maximum is attained at r^*_{31} iff $u^s(r^*_{21} \mid \alpha) \le u^s\left(r^*_{31} \mid \alpha\right) \Leftrightarrow \dfrac{1}{8}(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2)^2 \le \dfrac{1}{24}(\alpha - 2c - 3T_2)^2$. Both terms $(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2)$ and $(\alpha - 2c - 3T_2)$ are non-negative since $\alpha \ge 2T_1 + T_2$ and $c \le T_1 - T_2$ hold by assumption. Hence, we may take the square root of both sides to obtain

$$u^s(r^*_{21} \mid \alpha) \le u^s\left(r^*_{31} \mid \alpha\right) \iff \left(\sqrt{3} - 1\right)\alpha \le \sqrt{3}T_1 + \left(2\sqrt{3} - 3\right)T_2 + \left(\sqrt{3} - 2\right)c$$

$$\iff \alpha \le \frac{3}{2}S + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}D - \frac{\sqrt{3} - 1}{2}c$$

Now, it is straightforward to check that the following ordering is equivalent to $c \le D$, which is true by the defining condition of Case A.

$$2T_1 + T_2 \le \frac{3}{2}S + \frac{5}{6}D - \frac{1}{3}c \le \frac{3}{2}S + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}D - \frac{\sqrt{3} - 1}{2}c \le \frac{3}{2}S + \frac{9}{10}D - \frac{2}{5}c \le 3T_1 - c$$

Hence, by the previous discussion and after observing that $\frac{3}{2}S + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}D - \frac{\sqrt{3}-1}{2}c = 3T_2 + \Delta - \frac{\sqrt{3}-1}{2}c$, we conclude that the optimal solution r^* in this case is given by

$$r^* = \begin{cases} r^*_{31} = \frac{1}{4}(\alpha - 2c - 3T_2), & \text{if } \ 2T_1 + T_2 \le \alpha \le 3T_2 + \Delta - \frac{\sqrt{3}-1}{2}c \\ r^*_{21} = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2), & \text{if } \ 3T_2 + \Delta - \frac{\sqrt{3}-1}{2}c \le \alpha < 3T_1 - c \end{cases}$$

A4. $3T_1 - c \le \alpha \le 3T_1 + c$. Now, the supplier's payoff function is given by

$$u^s(r \mid \alpha) = r \cdot \begin{cases} q^*_{21}(r+c), & 0 \le r \le \alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2 \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and hence, as a quadratic polynomial in r, it is maximized at $r^* = r^*_{21}$.

A5. $3T_1 + c \le \alpha$. Now

$$u^s(r \mid \alpha) = r \cdot \begin{cases} q^*_{11}(r+c), & 0 \le r \le \alpha - c - 3T_1 \\ q^*_{21}(r+c), & \alpha - c - 3T_1 \le r \le \alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2 \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Now, the first part is maximized at r^*_{11} and the second at r^*_{21}. Again, one checks easily that $0 < r^*_{11} < r^*_{21} < \alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2$. As in Case A3, in order to determine the maximum of $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$ with respect to r we distinguish three sub-cases.

A5.1. $0 < r^*_{11} < r^*_{21} \le \alpha - c - 3T_1$. Then the overall maximum of $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$ is attained at r^*_{11}. The inequality $r^*_{21} \le \alpha - c - 3T_1$ holds iff $\frac{1}{2}(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2) \le \alpha - c - 3T_1 \Leftrightarrow \alpha \ge \frac{3}{2}S + \frac{7}{2}D + c$.

A5.2. $\alpha - c - 3T_1 \le r^*_{11} < r^*_{21}$. Then the overall maximum of $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$ is attained at r^*_{21}. The inequality $\alpha - c - 3T_1 \le r^*_{11}$ holds iff $\alpha - c - 3T_1 \le \frac{1}{2}\left(\alpha - c - \frac{3}{2}T_1 - \frac{3}{2}T_2\right) \Leftrightarrow \alpha \le \frac{3}{2}S + 3D + c$.

A5.3. $0 < r^*_{11} < \alpha - c - 3T_1 < r^*_{21}$. In this case we need to compare the payoffs $u^s(r^*_{11} \mid \alpha)$ and $u^s(r^*_{21} \mid \alpha)$. The overall maximum is attained at r^*_{11} iff

$$u^s(r^*_{21} \mid \alpha) \le u^s(r^*_{11} \mid \alpha) \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{8}(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2)^2 \le \frac{1}{6}\left(\alpha - c - \frac{3}{2}T_1 - \frac{3}{2}T_2\right)^2$$

Both terms $(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2)$ and $\left(\alpha - c - \frac{3}{2}T_1 - \frac{3}{2}T_2\right)$ are positive since $\alpha \ge 3T_1 + c$ holds by assumption. Hence, we may take the square root of both sides to obtain

$$u^s(r^*_{21} \mid \alpha) \le u^s(r^*_{11} \mid \alpha) \iff \left(3 - \sqrt{3}\right)T_1 + \left(3 - 2\sqrt{3}\right)T_2 + \left(2 - \sqrt{3}\right)c \le \left(2 - \sqrt{3}\right)\alpha$$

$$\iff \frac{3}{2}S + \left(\frac{3}{2} + \sqrt{3}\right)D + c \le \alpha$$

Now, since $\frac{3}{2}S + \left(\frac{3}{2} + \sqrt{3}\right)D + c = 3T_2 + 2\Delta + c$ and $3T_1 + c \le \frac{3}{2}S + 3D + c \le \frac{3}{2}S + \left(\frac{3}{2} + \sqrt{3}\right)D + c \le \frac{3}{2}S + \frac{7}{2}D + c$, we conclude that the optimal solution r^* in this case is given by

$$r^* = \begin{cases} r^*_{21} = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha - c - T_1 - 2T_2), & \text{if } \ 3T_1 + c \le \alpha \le 3T_2 + 2\Delta + c \\ r^*_{11} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\alpha - c - \frac{3}{2}T_1 - \frac{3}{2}T_2\right), & \text{if } \ 3T_2 + 2\Delta + c \le \alpha \end{cases}$$

This concludes case **A**.

Case B. Let $0 \leq D < c$. Then, $3T_1 - c < 2T_1 + T_2 < T_1 + 2T_2 + c < \min(3T_1 + c, 3T_2 + 2c)$ and hence for the different values of α we have

B1. $0 \leq \alpha \leq T_1 + 2T_2 + c$. Now $u^s(r \mid \alpha) \equiv 0$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and hence $r^* = r \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

B2. $T_1 + 2T_2 + c \leq \alpha \leq 3T_1 + c$. Now, the supplier's payoff function is given by

$$u^s(r \mid \alpha) = r \cdot \begin{cases} q_{21}^*(r + c), & 0 \leq r \leq \alpha - T_1 - 2T_2 - c \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and hence as a quadratic polynomial in r, it is maximized at $r^* = r_{21}^*$.

B3. $3T_1 + c \leq \alpha$. This case is identical to A5 above.

Collecting the results about the optimal strategy of the supplier in all sub-cases of **A** and **B**, we obtain the claim of Proposition A.2. □

Remark 2. Although, as has already been pointed out, the supplier's payoff function $u^s(r \mid \alpha)$ is continuous at the cutting points of the α-intervals, the same is *not* true for the supplier's optimal strategy as can be checked from Proposition A.2. For given T_1, T_2, $T_1 \geq T_2$, not only $r^*(\alpha)$ is not continuous in α, but it is also not increasing in α (although it is increasing on each sub-interval). At the points of discontinuity the supplier is indifferent between the left hand side and right hand side strategies. However, any mixture of these strategies does not yield the same payoff since his payoff is not linear in r^*. The reason for these discontinuities is that the supplier faces a piecewise linear demand instead of a linear demand. Therefore, at the cutting points he "jumps" from the arg max of the first linear part to the arg max of the other linear part, hence the discontinuity. This also explains the decrease of the optimal price as we move from certain cutting points to the right, even if the increase in the demand intercept α is ϵ-small. Of course, one may check that under his optimal strategy, not only the supplier's payoff is continuous, but it is also an increasing function of the demand α, as expected.

A.3 Case of n identical retailers

Proof Proposition 7.1. For $i \in N$, the best reply correspondence of retailer R_i is given by Lemma 3.2 if we replace Q_j by Q_{-i}. Hence, we may simplify the proof by fixing $i \in N$ and distinguishing the following cases:

Case 1. Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq (n+1)T$ and for $N \ni j \neq i$ let $t_j^* = \frac{1}{n+1}\alpha, q_j^* = 0$. Then, $Q_{-i}^* = \frac{n-1}{n+1}\alpha \geq \alpha - 2T$. Hence, by Lemma 3.2, $\mathrm{BR}^i(Q_{-i}^*) = (t_i^*, q_i^*) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{n+1}, 0\right)$.

Case 2. Let $(n+1)T < \alpha \leq (n+1)T + w$ and for $N \ni j \neq i$ let $t_j^* = T, q_j^* = 0$. Then $Q_{-i}^* = (n-1)T$ with $\alpha - w - 2T \leq Q_{-i}^* < \alpha - 2T$. Hence, by Lemma 3.2, $\mathrm{BR}^i(Q_{-i}^*) = (t_i^*, q_i^*) = (T, 0)$.

Case 3. Let $(n+1)T + w < \alpha$ and for $N \ni j \neq i$ let $t_j^* = T, q_j^* = \frac{1}{n+1}(\alpha - (n+1)T - w)$. Then $Q_{-i}^* = \frac{n-1}{n+1}(\alpha - w) < \alpha - w - 2T$. As above $\mathrm{BR}^i(Q_{-i}^*) = (t_i^*, q_i^*) = \left(T, \frac{1}{n+1}(\alpha - (n+1)T - w)\right)$.

Summing up, we obtain the equilibrium strategies as given in Proposition 7.1. □

References

Mark Bagnoli and Ted Bergstrom. Log-concave probability and its applications. *Economic Theory*, 26(2): 445–469, 2005. doi:10.1007/s00199-004-0514-4.

Fernando Bernstein and Awi Federgruen. Decentralized supply chains with competing retailers under demand uncertainty. *Management Science*, 51(1):18–29, 2005. doi:10.1287/mnsc.1040.0218.

Patrick Billingsley. *Probability and measure, 2nd edition*. Wiley, NewYork, 1986.

Gian Italo Bischi, Carl Chiarella, Michael Kopel, and Ferenc Szidarovszky. *Nonlinear Oligopolies: Stability and Bifurcations*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009. ISBN 9783642021060.

David Bradley and Ramesh Gupta. Limiting behaviour of the mean residual life. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 55(1):217–226, 2003. doi:10.1007/BF02530495.

Grard Cachon and Serguei Netessine. Game theory in supply chain analysis. In David Simchi-Levi, David Wu, and Zuo-Jun Shen, editors, *Handbook of Quantitative Supply Chain Analysis*, volume 74 of *International Series in Operations Research & Management Science*, pages 13–65. Springer US, 2004. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-7953-5_2.

Ezra Einy, Ori Haimanko, Diego Moreno, and Benyamin Shitovitz. On the existence of Bayesian Cournot equilibrium. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 68(1):77–94, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.geb.2009.06.002.

Frank Guess and Frank Proschan. Mean residual life: theory and applications. In P. R. Krishnaiah and C. R. Rao, editors, *Quality Control and Reliability*, volume 7 of *Handbook of Statistics*, pages 215–224. Elsevier Amsterdam, 1988. doi:10.1016/S0169-7161(88)07014-2.

W. Hall and Jon Wellner. Mean residual life. In M. Csørgø, D. A. Dawson, J. N. K. Rao, and A. K. Md. E. Saleh, editors, *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Statistics and Related Topics*, pages 169–184. North Holland Amsterdam, 1981.

Robin Hartwig, Karl Inderfurth, Abdolkarim Sadrieh, and Guido Voigt. Strategic inventory and supply chain behavior. *Production and Operations Management*, 24(8):1329–1345, 2015. doi:10.1111/poms.12325.

Chris Jones. Kumaraswamy's distribution: A beta-type distribution with some tractability advantages. *Statistical Methodology*, 6:70–81, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.stamet.2008.04.001.

Johan Lagerlöf. Equilibrium uniqueness in a cournot model with demand uncertainty. *The B.E. Journal in Theoretical Economics*, Vol. 6: Iss 1. (Topics), Article 19:1–6, 2006. doi:10.2202/1534-598X.1333.

Martin Lariviere. A note on probability distributions with increasing generalized failure rates. *Operations Research*, 54(3):602–604, 2006. doi:10.1287/opre.1060.0282.

Martin Lariviere and Evan Porteus. Selling to the newsvendor: An analysis of price-only contracts. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 3(4):293–305, 2001. doi:10.1287/msom.3.4.293.9971.

Leslie M. Marx and Greg Schaffer. Cournot competition with a common input supplier. Working paper, Duke University, 2015. URL https://faculty.fuqua.duke.edu/~marx/bio/papers/MarxShaffer_Cournot_2015.pdf.

Roger Myerson and Mark Satterthwaite. Efficient mechanisms for bilateral trading. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 29(2):265–281, 1983. doi:10.1016/0022-0531(83)90048-0.

Martin Osborne and Carolyn Pitchik. Price competition in a capacity-constrained duopoly. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 38(2):238–260, 1986. doi:10.1016/0022-0531(86)90117-1.

Jan Richter. Incomplete information in Cournot oligopoly: The case of unknown production capacities. EWI Working Papers 2013-1, Energiewirtschaftliches Institut an der Universitaet zu Koeln, 2013. URL http://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:ris:ewikln:2013_001.

Xavier Vives. *Oligopoly pricing: old ideas and new tools*. MIT press, 2001. ISBN 9780262720403.